

As Examiner properly recognizes, Papadopoulos et al. fails to teach or suggest the steps of identifying at a web server a network address of a user accessing the web server via a network, and restricting access of the user to selected published web screens of the plurality of web screens published by the web server based upon the identified address of the user as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 5. Applicant respectfully submits that, contrary to Examiner's position, Shannon et al. fails to overcome this deficiency and the rejections should be withdrawn.

In particular, Shannon et al. is directed to a network device, such as a proxy server, router, switch, firewall, bridge or other network gateway, that interfaces between a Local Area Network (LAN) and a Wide Area Network (WAN) to provide data and information access control between a client connected to the LAN and a web server connected to the WAN. The network device serves as a "gateway" through which all data communications must pass between the LAN and the WAN (see Col. 5, lines 6-21 and 51-63). The network device determines whether or not a particular request from a client should be forwarded to the WAN and thus to the server (see Col. 12, lines 37-45 and Col. 13, lines 23-29).

By contrast, in Applicant's claimed invention, as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 5, a request from a remote computer (i.e., "client") is forwarded to the web server that publishes the plurality of web screens, and it is that web server which identifies a network address of a user accessing the web server via the network and restricts access of the user to selected published web screens of the

plurality of web screens published by the web server based on the identified address of the user. In other words, in Applicant's claimed invention as recited in each of independent claims 1 and 5, the access control function is performed by the web server that publishes the plurality of web screens and not by any intermediate "gateway" device as taught by Shannon. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that the hypothetical combination of Papadopoulos et al. and Shannon as sought in the rejection fails to teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention and the rejections should be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejections of claims 1 and 5 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant respectfully submits that it is clear from Applicant's disclosure that the controller (14) is "independent of" - i.e., not the same hardware as - host PC (13) and web server (20) and is coupled thereto through an RS232 connection in one embodiment as shown in Fig. 1 and described at Page 6, lines 11-23, and Page 13, lines 22-24, for example. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is improper and should be withdrawn.

Moreover, as claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 5, and further as each of these claims recites a combination of steps or elements not taught or suggested by the prior art of record, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable as well.